UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,323	06/26/2006	Jurgen Stauder	PF040008	1975
24498 7590 06/21/2010 Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations THOMSON Licensing LLC P.O. Box 5312			EXAMINER	
			PATEL, NIRAV G	
Princeton, NJ 0	8543-5312		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/584,323	STAUDER ET AL.
zammer minated interview cammary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nirav G. Patel	2624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Nirav G. Patel</u> .	(3)	
(2) Wan Yee Cheung (Reg. No.: 42,410).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>15 June 2010</u>	Time: <u>3:15 p.m.</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: Onda		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Nirav G. Patel/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that the amendments submitted on 3/24/2010 are essentially the same as those which were previously rejected in the Final Office Action dated 6/2/2009 and that prosecution was not being advanced. The Examiner indicated his interpretation of the reference and how it still reads on the amended claims, and as such requested the applicants to point out any subject matter which may not be claimed but is in the originally filed specification. The applicants indicated that a further review would be needed and therefore were unable to further discuss the case.